REMARKS

The office action of January 24, 2008, has been carefully considered.

It is noted that claims 1-4 and 6-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over EP 0781609 to Kramer in view of JP 05-161902 to Konose et al. and the patent to Langer et al.

Claims 5 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Kramer, Konose et al. and Langer et al., and further in view of the patent to Ginzburg.

In view of the Examiner's rejections of the claims, applicant has canceled claims 2 and 4, and amended claims 1 and 6.

It is respectfully submitted that the claims presently on file differ essentially and in an unobvious, highly advantageous manner from the constructions and methods disclosed in the references.

Turning now to the references and particularly to Kramer, it can be seen that this reference discloses a method and

installation for hot rolling bands.

The reference to Konose et al. discloses hot rolling equipment.

The patent to Langer et al. discloses a plant and process for hot-rolling strip or plate stock.

The Examiner combined these references in determining that claims 1-4 and 6-8 would be unpatentable over such a combination. Applicant respectfully submits that none of these references, nor their combination, teach a rolling mill and method for hot rolling aluminum as in the presently claimed invention. The combination does not teach a rolling mill have all of the features now recited in the claims. Particularly, there is no teaching of the roughing tandem train and the finishing train being operated in a reversing mode, together with the other features in the claim.

Applicant also repeats the following arguments from the last amendment which are believed to still be applicable.

Kramer explicitly teaches a single preparation stand and a single finishing stand, and gives no teaching concerning the

rolling of aluminum with multiple two finishing stands. Konose et al. teach a roughing stand (there is no teaching of a finishing stand) that rolls in tandem and puts out rough strip for the finishing train. From the drawing of Konose et al. one can see that there is a connecting unit or looping pit. There is no direct connection from the tandem roughing train to the finishing train. This means that the rough strip must lie ay least once on the flat train. Therefore, the spacing between the roughing train and the finishing train is fixed. There is no teaching of combining the roughing and finishing into a tandem operation in order to reduce mill lengths. In Langer et al. it is impossible to reverse roll the strip in the roughing stand. Furthermore, the described finishing stand would make very difficult an effective strip finishing that can be directly connected with large strip lengths. In the presently claimed invention there is a tandem rolling of the roughing and finishing stands, for which the mill of Langer et al. is not suited because the roughing train does not reverse. The roughing stand of Langer et al. remains stationary during the finish rolling, while in the present invention the rolling of the next strip is possible.

A combination of these three references does not teach or suggest the present invention. The combination of references would

not result in a tandem operation since there is no showing of a revering roughing train in Konose et al. and Langer et al. There is no teaching of a direct combination of the roughing and finishing in a tandem operation, as in the presently claimed invention. Furthermore, the combination does not teach a rolling mill or a method for hot rolling aluminum in which the roughing train does not include a coiler, whereby the rolling stock passes directly from the roughing train to the finishing train, as in the presently claimed invention.

In view of these considerations it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of claims 1-4 and 6-8 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over a combination of the above-discussed references is overcome and should be withdrawn.

The patent to Ginzburg et al. has also been considered. Applicant submits that this reference adds nothing to the teachings of the previously discussed references so as to teach the present invention. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of claims 5 and 9 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) is overcome and should be withdrawn.

Reconsideration and allowance of the present application are

respectfully requested.

Any additional fees or charges required at this time in connection with this application may be charged to Patent and Trademark Office Deposit Account No. 11-1835.

Respectfully submitted,

By
Klaus P. Stoffel
Reg. No. 31,668
For: Friedrich Kueffner
Reg. No. 29,482
317 Madison Avenue, Suite 910
New York, New York 10017
(212) 986-3114

Dated: April 24, 2008

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, PO Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on April 24, 2008.

By: _____
Klaus P. Stoffel

Date: April 24, 2008